



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,819	01/31/2002	Thadd Clark Patton	13DV14087	6238
6111	7590	10/21/2004	EXAMINER	
			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		
DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	dly/b
	10/062,819	PATTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 1/31/02 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/31/02</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320).

As per claims 1, 9, and 16, Crandall discloses a method of generating a sanitized document including obtaining a document, the document including a number of types of information which includes restricted and unrestricted information (See Crandall, Page 1, paragraphs 0003 and 0008), reviewing the document to identify a preselected type of information, such as restricted information (See Crandall, Page 3, paragraph 0033), and marking or tagging the identified preselected type of information in the document to generate a marked document, where the marked identified preselected type of information in the marked document is distinguishable from other types of information in the marked document (See Crandall, Page 3, paragraph 0033). Crandall does not disclose expressly executing an application on the marked document to generate a sanitized document and log file, where the marked identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, is removed from the sanitized document and is

included in the log file. Crandall also does not disclose expressly storing the marked document, the sanitized document and the log file in a database accessible by a number of users to provide to an external source. Uemoto discloses creating a sanitized document in the form of an upstream special candidate file which does not contain the preselected information and a log file in the form of a deletion file which does contain the preselected information. (See Uemoto, Figure 1B, element SA16). Uemoto also discloses that the files are stored in a database or repository accessible to a number of users (See Uemoto, Column 20, lines 29-41). Crandall and Uemoto are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing data between multiple output files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the sanitized document, log file, and storing of the files of Uemoto with the system and method of Crandall. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide documents which are reusable. (See Uemoto, Column 20, line 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Uemoto with Crandall for the benefit of reusing the documents to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 9 and 16.

As per claim 6, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Crandall also discloses reviewing the document to identify a preselected type of information in the document also including executing a search or filtering application on the document to search for a keyword in the document, which is one of the possible reviewing methods set forth in claim 6.

As per claim 7, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Crandall also discloses verifying the information has been removed from the sanitized document before the step of storing the marked document, the sanitized document, and the log file in a database and repeating the steps of reviewing the document, marking the identified preselected type of information in the document and executing an application to generate a sanitized document and a log file from the marked document until all of the preselected type of information has been verified as being removed from the sanitized document. (See Crandall, Page 2, paragraph 0022).

As per claim 20, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claim 16 as described above. Crandall also discloses the use of an intranet which, as is well known in the art, includes predetermined access rights for users. (See Crandall, Page 3, paragraph 0030).

Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320) as applied to claims 1, 9, and 16 above, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent 6,263,336 B1).

As per claims 2, 10, and 17, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claims 1, 9 and 16 as described above. Crandall and Uemoto do not disclose expressly locating a starting point and an ending point of a portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document, indicating in the document, the starting point and ending point for the portion of the identified preselected

type of information, or restricted information, in the document, and repeating the steps of locating and identifying until all portions of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document have been identified. Tanaka discloses locating a starting and ending point for a portion of the restricted information (See Tanaka, Column 3, lines 49-54), indicating, in the document, the starting and ending points (See Tanaka, Column 3, lines 49-54), and repeating the steps of locating and identifying the restricted information until all portions of restricted information in the document have been identified. (See Tanaka, Column 3, lines 29-34). Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification of the starting and ending points of the restricted information in the document of Tanaka with the system and method of Crandall and Uemoto. The motivation for doing so would have been to clearly mark the scope of text for extraction (See Tanaka, Column 3, lines 50-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanaka with Crandall and Uemoto for the benefit of clearly marking the scope of text for extraction to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2, 10 and 17.

As per claims 3 and 11, Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka disclose the limitations of claims 2 and 10 as described above. Crandall also discloses highlighting the selected portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document in a preselected color (See Crandall, Page 3-4, paragraphs 0033-0034), a,

which is included as one of the possible methods of indication set forth in claims 3 and 11.

Claims 4, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320) and Tanaka (U.S. Patent 6,263,336 B1) as applied to claims 2, 10, and 17 above, and further in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 6,609,200 B2).

As per claims 4, 12, and 18, Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka disclose the limitations of claims 2, 10, and 17 as described above. Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka do not disclose expressly inserting a first tag at the starting point of the portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document, and inserting a second tag at the ending point of the portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document. Anderson discloses inserting a tag at the beginning and ending points of the selected portion of information in the document (See Anderson, Column 4, lines 40-47). Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Anderson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the insertion of tags at the starting and ending points of the selected information in the document of Anderson with the system and method of Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to express the meaning of a particular textual unit in relationship to other textual units (See Anderson, Column 4, lines 36-40). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to combine Anderson with Crandall, Uemoto, and Tanaka for the benefit of identifying the particular meaning of a portion of text in the document to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 12, and 18.

Claims 5, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320) and Tanaka (U.S. Patent 6,263,336 B1) as applied to claims 2 and 10 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Patent 6,415,307 B2).

As per claims 5 and 13, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claims 2 and 10 as described above. Crandall also discloses inserting a marker in the sanitized document corresponding to the portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document (See Crandall, Claim 7). Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka do not disclose expressly indicating the starting and ending points of the portion of the identified preselected type of information, or restricted information, in the document with a first indication style. Jones discloses using specialized types of fonts to indicate the starting and ending points of data. (See Jones, Column 14, lines 8-22) Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the specialized types of fonts of Jones with the system and method of Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently identify keywords or text in the document. (See Jones, Column 14, lines 11-13) Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Jones with Crandall, Uemoto and Tanaka for the benefit of easily identifying keywords or text to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 13.

As per claim 14, Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones disclose the limitations of claim 13 as described above. Crandall also discloses parsing the tagged document for an indicated portion of the identified restricted information in the draft document and removing the parsed portion of the identified restricted information in the draft document from the sanitized document (See Crandall, Claim 7), and inserting a marker in the sanitized document in response to the parsed portion of the identified restricted information in the draft document being in the first indication style (See Crandall, Claim 7). Tanaka also discloses omitting the marker in the sanitized document in response to the parsed portion of the identified restricted information in the draft document being in the second indication style (See Tanaka, Column 6, lines 16-20). Uemoto also discloses inserting the parsed portion of the restricted information in the draft document into the log file, or deletion file. (See Uemoto, Figure 1B, element SA16). Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the omission of the marker in the sanitized document of Tanaka with the system and method of Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the computational volume and make the processing easier (See Tanaka, Column 6, lines 35-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanaka with Crandall,

Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones for the benefit of reducing data volume and simplifying processing. At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include insertion of the parsed portion of the restricted information of the draft document into the deletion file of Uemoto with the system and method of Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve the efficiency of document conversions and document preparation. (See Uemoto, Column 2, lines 25-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Uemoto with Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones for the benefit of improving the efficiency of document conversion and preparation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320) as applied to claims 7 and 9 above, and further in view of Fahlman (U.S. Patent 5,960,080).

As per claims 8 and 15, Crandall and Uemoto disclose the limitations of claims 7 and 9 as described above. Crandall and Uemoto do not disclose expressly that the step of obtaining a draft document includes one of creating a new document and downloading a previously created document. Fahlman discloses the step of creating a new document (See Fahlman, Column 3, lines 28-29). Crandall, Uemoto and Fahlman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing multiple types of data in a file. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the creation of a new file of Fahlman with the system and method of Crandall and Uemoto. The motivation for doing so would have been to transmit a confidential message. (See Fahlman, Column 3, lines 27-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fahlman with Crandall and Uemoto for the benefit of creating a confidential message to be transmitted to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 15.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crandall (U.S. Publication 2002/0143827 A1) in view of Uemoto (U.S. Patent 5,497,320), Tanaka (U.S. Patent 6,263,336 B1) and Anderson (U.S. Patent 6,609,200 B2) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Patent 6,415,307 B2).

As per claim 19, Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 18 as described above. Tanaka also discloses a preselected color signaling the means for generating the sanitized document to insert a marker in the sanitized document and a second preselected color signaling the means for generating the sanitized document to omit the marker in the sanitized document for the selected portion of the preselected information in the document (See Tanaka, Column 5, lines 60-61, and Column 6, lines 16-20). Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Anderson do not disclose expressly a first preselected style and a second preselected style signaling the means for generating the sanitized document to insert a marker in the sanitized document for the selected portion of the preselected information in the document and the signaling the means for generating the sanitized document to omit the marker in the

sanitized document for the selected portion of the preselected information in the document. Jones discloses using specialized types of fonts to indicate the starting and ending points of data. (See Jones, Column 14, lines 8-22) Crandall also discloses inserting a marker at the starting and ending points of the preselected information (See Crandall, Claim 7). Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Jones are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data files. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the specialized types of fonts of Jones with the system and method of Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently identify keywords or text in the document. (See Jones, Column 14, lines 11-13) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jones with Crandall, Uemoto, Tanaka and Anderson for the benefit of easily identifying keywords or text to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Redlich (U.S. Publication 2002/0091975 A1) discloses a data security system and method for separation of user communities.
- Adjaoute (U.S. Publication 2003/0009495 A1) discloses systems and methods for filtering electronic content.
- Anick et al discloses a full-text information retrieval system.

- Adelberg discloses a tool for semi-automatically extracting structured and semistructured data from text documents.
- Dorre et al discloses data mining and analysis techniques.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER